

Update on Teacher Effectiveness

Jennifer Preston

Race to the Top Project Coordinator for Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

(919) 807-4187

Jennifer.Preston@dpi.nc.gov

Eliz Colbert

Lead Professional Development Consultant

(919) 807-4037

Eliz.Colbert@dpi.nc.gov



Agenda

1. Review of Teacher Effectiveness Policies in Race to the Top
2. New Sixth and Eighth Standards
3. Annual Evaluation Requirement and Abbreviated Evaluation Option
4. Measures of Student Learning for Non-Tested Grades and Subjects



Review of Teacher Effectiveness Policies in Race to the Top



Inclusion of Student Growth:

The State will add a student growth component to the teacher and principal evaluation process.

A Teacher Effectiveness Work Group comprised of representative stakeholders will consider how to add the components and address technical concerns.



Importance of Student Growth:

A teacher's ability to make significant growth with his or her students is critical to the future of education and children in North Carolina.

Given its importance, student growth should continue to be an integral component of the teacher evaluation process.



Importance of Student Growth:

Percent of Teachers Rated as Accomplished or Distinguished		
Standard	Schools that did NOT make expected growth	Schools that did make expected growth
Standard One	67.39	64.06
Standard Two	67.21	66.87
Standard Three	55.17	60.99
Standard Four	63.79	63.93
Standard Five	72.00	63.8

Current evaluation ratings are not correlated with student growth.



Effective Educators:

Student Growth
Meets
Expectations

Proficient or Higher
on All Standards

Effective
Teacher

Student Growth
Exceeds Expected
Growth

Accomplished or
Higher on All
Standards

Highly
Effective
Teacher



New Sixth and Eighth Standards



Teacher Evaluation Standards:

Standard One

- Teachers demonstrate leadership

Standard Two

- Teachers establish a respectful environment

Standard Three

- Teachers know the content they teach

Standard Four

- Teachers facilitate learning for their students

Standard Five

- Teachers reflect on their practice



Sixth Standard for Teachers:

TEACHERS CONTRIBUTE TO THE
ACADEMIC SUCCESS OF STUDENTS.

The work of the teacher results in acceptable, measurable progress for students based on established performance expectations using appropriate data to demonstrate growth.



Adding Standard Six:

Standard One

- Teachers demonstrate leadership

Standard Two

- Teachers establish a respectful environment

Standard Three

- Teachers know the content they teach

Standard Four

- Teachers facilitate learning for their students

Standard Five

- Teachers reflect on their practice

Standard Six

- Teachers contribute to the academic success of students



Principal Evaluation Standards:

Standard One

- Strategic Leadership

Standard Two

- Instructional Leadership

Standard Three

- Cultural Leadership

Standard Four

- Human Resource Leadership

Standard Five

- Managerial Leadership

Standard Six

- External Development Leadership

Standard Seven

- Micropolitical Leadership



Eighth Standard for Principals:

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT LEADERSHIP

Summary: School executives will contribute to the academic success of students. The work of the school executive will result in acceptable, measurable progress for students based on established performance expectations using appropriate data to demonstrate growth.



Adding Standard Eight:

Standard One

- Strategic Leadership

Standard Two

- Instructional Leadership

Standard Three

- Cultural Leadership

Standard Four

- Human Resource Leadership

Standard Five

- Managerial Leadership

Standard Six

- External Development Leadership

Standard Seven

- Micropolitical Leadership

Standard Eight

- Academic Achievement Leadership



Moving Forward:

Over the next year, sixty teacher work groups will design measures of growth for non-tested grades and subjects.

A vendor will advise the Teacher Effectiveness Work Group on the selection of a student growth model.



Proceeding with Caution:

No teacher will be evaluated on the sixth standard until he or she has three years of valid student achievement data.

When three years of data are used, the chance of misclassification of a teacher is lower.



Proceeding with Caution:

Using the current data for grades 3 – 8 math and English Language Arts teachers, less than five percent are not making expected growth.

Under the current EVAAS system, nearly 80 percent of teachers stay in the same category (not detectably different) each year.



Issues for Consideration:

The Teacher Effectiveness Work Group will consider:

1. The measures of growth used to rank a teacher on the sixth standard.
2. The number of ratings associated with the sixth and eighth standards.
3. The “cut points” used to separate teachers and principals into ratings.



Issues for Consideration:

1. The measures of growth used to rank a teacher on the sixth standard.

Under Consideration: combination of team, individual, and school value-added measures.



Issues for Consideration:

2. The number of ratings associated with the sixth and eighth standards.

Under Consideration: highly effective, effective, and needs improvement.



Issues for Consideration:

3. The “cut points” used to separate teachers and principals into ratings.

Under Consideration: use of two standard deviations above and below the mean as markers for needs improvement and highly effective.



Annual Evaluation Requirement and Abbreviated Evaluation Option



Reasons for Annual Evaluation:

Districts and the State have to know how teachers are performing; current statute allows some districts to evaluate career-status teachers according to local policy.

More frequent evaluation is necessary to ensure that all students are receiving high-quality instruction.



Reasons for Annual Evaluation:

Required for school districts that accepted funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (all districts in NC).

Required for all school districts and charter schools that accepted funding from Race to the Top (all districts and group of charters).



Annual Evaluation Policy:

Each local board shall adopt a policy requiring career teachers to be evaluated annually. The annual evaluation requirements shall be met by either: (1) Using the Teacher Evaluation Process as set forth in 16 NCAC 6C.0503; or (2) Using an abbreviated evaluation consisting of Standards One, Four, and Six of the Teacher Evaluation Process.



Concerns about Annual Evaluation:

The new evaluation instrument is more thorough and specific, and, therefore, takes longer for evaluators to complete.

The House and Senate budgets reduced the number of assistant principals.

Principals may not have time to complete the entire evaluation process for all staff members.



Annual Abbreviated Evaluation:

Standard One

- Teachers demonstrate leadership.

Standard Four

- Teachers facilitate learning for their students

Standard Six

- Teachers contribute to the academic success of students.



Requirements for Abbreviated Evaluation:

The abbreviated evaluation option includes:

- Teacher Self-Assessment
- Professional Development Plan
- Two Informal Observations (at least twenty minutes each)
- Summary Evaluation Conference (on Standards One, Four, and Six)
- Summary Rating Form (on Standards One, Four, and Six)



Work in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects



Original Plan:

Teacher work groups meet to design measures of student learning for non-tested grades and subjects.

The State of Delaware (much smaller with a more limited set of academic standards) experienced serious challenges with this approach.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools also faced resistance when they engaged a vendor to design such assessments.



Revised Plan:

The NCDPI brings together teacher work groups to create item specifications for an external vendor.

The vendor generates items; the teacher work groups vet them for inclusion in the measures of student learning for non-tested grades and subjects.



Working Plan:

1. Recruit educators to serve on work groups for non-tested subjects and grades.



2. Issue Request for Proposals for vendor to generate assessment items.



3. Design training for work groups.



Working Plan:

4. Schedule training.



5. Conduct training.



6. Vendor generates assessment items.



Working Plan:

7. Identify “open source” assessment items for inclusion on the new assessments.



8. Design vetting protocols for work groups.



9. Hold vetting sessions.

Working Plan:

10. Field-test and conduct psychometric analyses of assessments.



11. Load items onto IIS and prepare for delivery.



Discussion and Questions

